BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF STAFFORD STAFFORD, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

Special Meeting March 23, 2010

<u>Call to Order</u> A special meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Mark Dudenhefer, Chairman, at 6:02 P. M., Tuesday, March 23, 2010, in the Board Chambers, Stafford County Administration Center.

Roll Call The following members were present: Mark Dudenhefer, Chairman; Paul V. Milde III, Vice Chairman; Harry E. Crisp II; Gary F. Snellings; Cord A. Sterling; Susan B. Stimpson; and Robert "Bob" Woodson.

Also in attendance were: Anthony Romanello, County Administrator; Joe Howard, County Attorney; Marcia Hollenberger, Chief Deputy Clerk; Pamela Timmons, Deputy Clerk; associated staff and interested parties.

Finance and Budget; Authorize a Public Hearing for the FY2011 County Budgets and CY2010 Property Tax Rates Ms. Nancy Collins, Budget Division Director, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions.

Mr. Sterling asked if a \$1.14 tax rate would equal a 20% increase for commercial taxes. Mr. Scott Mayausky, Commissioner of the Revenue, stated that it would.

Mr. Crisp asked what the projected FY10 fund balance would be at a \$1.14 tax rate. Mr. Romanello stated that currently it is estimated to be approximately \$2.8M above the 10%,

but based on the third quarter review that will be given to the Board in two weeks, it may be slightly lower as revenue estimates are revised, and staff looks at the expenditures for the remainder of FY2010. Mr. Crisp asked at what rate the \$2.8M would no longer exist. Mr. Romanello responded that it would be at a tax rate of \$1.09.

Ms. Stimpson asked if the \$2.8M included a "worse case scenario". Mr. Romanello said it did.

Mr. Sterling asked, considering the state cuts, if Stafford County taxpayers would be used to backfill these cuts. Mr. Romanello stated that the County would have to assume a greater share.

Mr. Milde asked how many parcels are in the Land Use Program and how many years it has been in effect. Mr. Mayausky stated that there were approximately 1100 parcels in land use, and that the program has been in existence for 22 years. In response to a question about appeals, Mr. Mayausky replied that as of March 23, 2010, 71 people had filed an appeal of their assessment and that appeals (this year) are down from previous years.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked for a report from the Budget and Finance Committee.

Mr. Sterling reported that the Committee held several meetings and discussed the upcoming advertised tax rate. It voted on removing 2 cents from the tax rate recommended by the County Administrator, with the rationale being that the state has not made as many cuts as predicted. That vote was 2-1 with Mr. Snellings dissenting.

Ms. Stimpson stated that she felt that at an advertised \$1.12 tax rate, County homeowners will be able to keep more money in their pockets and noted that no cuts had been made on the County budget yet.

03/23/10- Page 3

Mr. Snellings reported that he was against lowering the advertised tax rate to \$1.12

because the Board does not have enough information, and favored advertising \$1.14.

This would give the Board room for adjustments to the budget since the rate can always

be lowered, but cannot be raised above the \$1.14 rate without a second public hearing.

Mr. Crisp stated that while he didn't want to set a rate that was too high, it was too soon

to know for sure what the state would do, that cuts are still being made and said that

advertising the \$1.14 rate was the prudent thing to do.

Mr. Snellings motioned, seconded by Mr. Crisp, to advertise the County Administrator's

recommended \$1.14 tax rate.

The Voting Board tally on the motion was:

Yea:

(3) Crisp, Snellings, Woodson

Nay: (4)

(4) Dudenhefer, Milde, Sterling, Stimpson

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Woodson asked if a \$1.12 tax rate would cut into core services and noted that \$4M

would be lost due to the repeal of BPOL. Mr. Romanello stated that "the answer is no,

based on \$1.12, but I think that between the potential new revenue and the reductions in

the cuts from the state; depending what the commissioner comes back with regarding the

appeals, I think that two cents would probably not result in a reduction in core services,

but could it result in a reduction in services - absolutely. I think it is very early, given

where we are with various pieces of information, and where we have only half or a

portion of information."

Mr. Sterling made a motion, seconded by Ms. Stimpson, to advertise a \$1.12 tax rate.

The Voting Board tally on the motion was:

Yea: (5) Dudenhefer, Milde, Snellings, Sterling, Stimpson

Nay: (2) Crisp, Woodson

Following the vote on the advertised tax rate, Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Ms. Stimpson, to adopt proposed Resolution R10-91.

The Voting Board tally on the motion was:

Yea: Sterling, Stimpson, Crisp, Dudenhefer, Milde, Snellings, (6)

Nay: (1) Woodson

Resolution R10-91 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2011 COUNTY BUDGETS AND THE PROPOSED 2010 PROPERTY TAX RATES

WHEREAS, the Code of Virginia requires that the governing body shall cause to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the County, a brief synopsis of the budget and proposed property tax levies and notices at a public hearing, at which any citizen of the County shall have the right to attend and state views thereon;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 23rd day of March, 2010, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to publish a brief synopsis of the Proposed Fiscal Year 2011 County Budgets and the Proposed 2010 Property Tax Rates for public hearing.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked that a discussion of the alternate position on the Board of Zoning Appeals be added to the April 6, 2010 agenda.

At 6:58 p.m., the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

Anthony J. Romanello, ICMA-CM Mark Dudenhefer Chairman

County Administrator